

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.584 of 2015

BETWEEN

Prajwal Singh

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary (Department of Home), Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

-
-

ORDER:

Heard.

2. Petitioner herein states that his brother-in-law was the subscriber of the chit run by respondent No.5 and in that connection he is allegedly indebted to respondent No.5. It is stated that petitioner's brother-in-law issued a cheque, which bounced and that resulted in exchange of notices under Section 138 of N.I.Act. However, petitioner has nothing to do with the said transaction. While so, petitioner states that he has been threatened by respondent Nos.3 and 4, at the instance of respondent No.5, for settling the claim of respondent No.5, though he is no way involved in the said

transaction. Hence, petitioner seeks a Mandamus against respondent Nos.2 to 4 not to harass the petitioner and not to interfere with the civil dispute.

3. Instructions of the learned Government Pleader, however, show that respondent No.5 filed a private complaint, which was forwarded to respondent No.3 with a direction to investigate. Accordingly, a case in crime No.999 of 2014 was registered and petitioner herein is shown as A3 apart from other accused. It is stated by respondent Nos.3 and 4 that investigation is pending after recording statement of the complainant and at present, it cannot be said that petitioner is no way involved in the said crime. It is also stated that depending upon the evidence adduced in the investigation, appropriate further action will be taken up. The allegation of the petitioner that there is any interference with the civil disputes or threats by the police is denied.

4. In view of the registration of the aforesaid crime and the investigation thereon being pending, no further orders are necessary except directing respondent Nos.3 and 4 to complete the investigation expeditiously. Petitioner is also at liberty to take appropriate steps, in accordance with law, with respect to the said crime.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

January 28, 2015
LMV